

U.S. Serial No. 10/661,748  
Filed: September 12, 2003  
Amendment and Response to Final Office Action dated 09/22/06

OCT 26 2006

DRAFT

**REMARKS**

This Amendment is a full and timely response to the Office Action dated September 22, 2006.

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-56 are pending in this application. Applicant has amended claims 1-14, 17-19, 22, 24, 25, 27-40, 43-45, 48, 50-53, and 56. No new matter is added by these amendments, and support for the amendments may be found throughout the specification and in the original claims.

In the September 22, 2006 Office Action, the Examiner rejected all claims 1-56. The Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejections and objection. For the reasons set forth below, the Applicants submit that the objection and rejections should be withdrawn and that the claims are in condition for allowance.

**I. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 101**

The Office Action rejected claims 1-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Applicant has amended claims 1, 27, and 53 to include "outputting a search result comprising the first article." Applicant asserts that outputting a search result results in a tangible result. As such, claims 1, 27, and 53 are directed to statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Because claims 2-26, 28-52, and 54-56 depend from and further limit claims 1, 27, and 53, claims 2-26, 28-52, and 54-56 are each directed to statutory subject matter for at least the same reasons.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 1-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 101.

U.S. Serial No. 10/661,748  
Filed: September 12, 2003  
Amendment and Response to Final Office Action dated 09/22/06

DRAFT

**II. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 1-53 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0186828 to Yadav (hereinafter referred to as “Yadav”).

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), “the reference must teach each and every element of the claim.” M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Because Yadav does not disclose “receiving a first search query; receiving a second search query; [and] determining a relationship between the first search query and the second search query” as recited in amended claim 1, Yadav does not anticipate claim 1.

1. Yadav discloses modifying a user’s search query to create an enhanced query by including synonyms and related terms. The enhanced query is then submitted to one or more search engines. However, Yadav, *inter alia*, does not disclose receiving first and second search queries, and determining a relationship between the first and secnd search queries. Yadav only discloses the use of a single search query. Thus, Yadav does not anticipate claim 1. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 1.

Like claim 1, claim 27 recites “determining a relationship between the first search query and the second search query.” For at least the same reasons that Yadav does not anticipate claim 1, Yadav does not anticipate claim 27. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 27.

U.S. Serial No. 10/661,748  
Filed: September 12, 2003  
Amendment and Response to Final Office Action dated 09/22/06

DRAFT

Because claims 2-26 and 28-52 depend from and further limit claims 1 and 27, respectively, Yadav does not anticipate claims 2-26 and 28-52 for at least the same reasons as claims 1 and 27. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 2-26 and 28-52.

### III. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claims 53-56 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,877,002 to Prince (hereinafter referred to as "Prince").

To anticipate a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), "the reference must teach each and every element of the claim." M.P.E.P. § 2131.

Because Prince does not disclose "receiving a first search query; receiving a second search query; [and] determining a relationship between the first search query and the second search query" as recited in amended claim 53, Prince does not anticipate claim 53. Prince teaches a system for compiling metadata relating to files in order to build a database to enhance search performance. Prince, *inter alia*, does not teach receiving a first and second search query, and determining a relationship between them. Thus, Prince does not anticipate claim 53. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claim 53.

Because claims 54-56 depend from and further limit claim 53, Prince does not anticipate claims 54-56 for at least the same reasons. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner withdraw the rejection of claims 54-56.

U.S. Serial No. 10/661,748  
Filed: September 12, 2003  
Amendment and Response to Final Office Action dated 09/22/06

RECEIVED  
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

OCT 26 2006

DRAFT

### CONCLUSION

The foregoing is submitted as a full and complete response to the Office Action of September 22, 2006. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. If the Examiner believes that there are any issues that can be resolved by a telephone conference, or that there are any informalities that can be corrected by an amendment, please call 404 815 6061.

Respectfully submitted,

**DRAFT**

Michael J. Turton  
Reg. No. 40,852

KILPATRICK STOCKTON LLP  
1100 Peachtree Street, Suite 2800  
Atlanta, Georgia 30309-4530  
Phone: 404 815 6061